

## **MEMORANDUM**

To: L. Mark Winson, Chair, Montgomery County Transit Task Force  
Thomas Street

Cc: Members of the Transit Task Force  
Adam Hafez  
Justin Willets

Date: October 30, 2011

From: Tina Slater, Chair (Routes and Development Sequencing, Group “D”)

Re: Updated Statement of the Working Group on Routes and Development Sequencing, per October 5, 2011 Full Task Force Meeting

### **WORK GROUP D’S PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESOLUTIONS FOR:**

- 1. THE ADDITION OF CERTAIN ROUTE SEGMENTS;**
- 2. THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN ROUTE SEGMENTS TO THE COUNTY’S BOUNDARY LINES; and**
- 3. THE SEQUENCING (PHASING) OF ROUTE SEGMENTS**

October 5, 2011 (updated and finalized October 30, 2011, changes noted by \*\*)

At its meeting on August 17, 2011, the Montgomery County Executive’s Transit Task Force unanimously approved the overall plan for the ~160 mile route system that was recommended by Work Group “D” (Routes and Sequencing) to be included in Montgomery County’s proposed County-wide rapid transit system.

### **PRACTICAL FACTORS CONSIDERED FOR SEQUENCING OF ROUTES**

With the overall route system approved by the full Transit Task Force at the August 17, 2011 meeting, Work Group “D” then analyzed the following 10 engineering, construction, public policy, and other practical factors, which guided Work Group D’s decisions on the most effective and efficient sequencing (phasing) of the routes:

1. Dividing the routes into phases that would be manageable for construction workloads and costs.
2. Avoiding construction of adjacent parallel roads during same time to prevent an entire traffic pattern from being taken out of service during construction.
3. Planning for adjacent alternative traffic routes and alternative transit options during construction to minimize disruption for commuters during construction.

4. Anticipating how each phase would transition to subsequent phases, so that constructing the additional route segments could be accomplished most efficiently and effectively.
5. Coordinating each phase to include segments that would provide reach to all parts of the County.
6. For the system to be most effective from the outset, the first phase must include the eastern, central, and western portions of the County, and provide at least two east-west connections (in this instance, the ICC and Randolph Road).
7. The phasing should consider the public policy objective of promoting responsible business and job growth opportunities, which could be facilitated with access to Rapid Transit Vehicles (“RTVs”).
8. The phasing should consider the public policy objective of providing for and encouraging easy linkages to surrounding jurisdictions (e.g., D.C., Prince George’s County, Howard County, and Frederick County).
9. The phasing should consider the public policy objective of providing RTV access to the County’s multi-cultural and diverse socio-economic populations.
10. The phasing should provide RTV access for large employers, hospitals, universities, community activity centers, and public high schools (perhaps even offering the opportunity to use RTVs in lieu of school buses or students driving cars to high schools).

## **TWO ADDITIONAL ROUTE SEGMENTS RECOMMENDED**

After further consideration of these factors, and with the goal of maximizing opportunities for “one-seat rides” in an inter-connected RTV system, Work Group D unanimously approved a recommendation to the Transit Task Force to amend its August 17, 2011 resolution to add the following additional route segments to the proposed County-wide RTV system:

- (a) Old Georgetown Road from Tuckerman Lane north to Montrose Road/Randolph Road, which should be designed to be incorporated into the new road alignments proposed in the approved White Flint Master Plan; and
- (b) Wisconsin Avenue from Bethesda Metro Station to Friendship Heights Metro Station.

Presuming the Transit Task Force approves this amendment, the Transit Task Force should recommend to the County Executive that he recommend to the County Council and Planning Board (as applicable) the inclusion of these two additional route segments into the County’s Master Plan of Highways and Transitways, as an additional part of the County-wide RTV system.

## **EXTENSIONS OF CERTAIN ROUTE SEGMENTS TO THE COUNTY’S BOUNDARY LINES**

Work Group D also recommends that the set of routes and sequencing be further revised, depending upon the future coordination and integration with surrounding jurisdictions. If Howard County, Prince George’s County, the District of Columbia, and/or Frederick County were willing to integrate and coordinate compatible rapid transit systems, then Work Group D recommends the following set of route segments within Montgomery County be added to extend the RTV system to the County boundary line, as applicable:

- Route 29 from Burtonsville north to Howard County line;
- Cherry Hill Road from FDA Boulevard east to Prince George's County line;
- Georgia Avenue from Silver Spring Transit Center south to District of Columbia line;
- Wisconsin Avenue from Friendship Heights south to District of Columbia line;
- and
- Route 355 from Clarksburg/CCT north to Frederick County line

In addition, if the U.S. Department of Transportation were willing to permit an integrated, coordinated, and compatible rapid transit system with Northern Virginia and Frederick County via the interstates, then Work Group D's recommended set of route segments within Montgomery County should also include connections to the Capital Beltway and I-270 (e.g., Montgomery Mall to I-270 to American Legion Bridge).

Presuming the Transit Task Force adopts these recommendations, the Transit Task Force should recommend to the County Executive that he recommend to the County Council and Planning Board (as applicable) the inclusion of these route segment extensions (to the County boundary lines) into the County's Master Plan of Highways and Transitways, which would allow for integration and coordination of the RTV system with surrounding jurisdictions.

## **RECOMMENDED SEQUENCING (PHASING) OF ROUTES**

Based upon the 10 practical considerations described above, and with the addition of the supplemental route segments described above, Work Group "D" *unanimously* approved the preliminary set of phasing recommendations, as set forth in the appended pages and maps identifying the proposed Phase One, Phase Two, and Phase Three sequencing.

Please note that these recommendations are preliminary in nature, recognizing that the final phasing of these route segments may have to be refined after careful analysis of the following factors (much of which could be accomplished with a 10% design and engineering study):

1. Engineering analysis of existing physical constraints, rights-of-way needed, and utility relocation required.
2. Determination of how needed rights-of-way can be acquired (and how long that process might be).
3. Consideration of construction disruption issues (such as the availability of alternative traffic patterns during construction).

Completion of full engineering, construction, and scheduling analyses may also result in a final determination that route segments suggested in any given phase may have to be divided into sub-phases, where only a portion of that route is built initially and the balance of that route is built at a later time. For example, it may be that right-of-way acquisition requirements (and/or coordination with the City of Gaithersburg and City of Rockville) might result in only portions of Route 355 being built initially (or perhaps without the "gold standard" RTV attributes), with the other portions of Route 355 being built at a later time. While these factors may require portions of route segments

to be sub-phased, the route segments as a whole are recommended to be phased generally as set forth in the appended pages and maps.

In addition to these engineering and other construction practicalities, each route segment would have to be evaluated to determine what level of potential RTV service would apply at the time the route (or particular segment of that route) is initially built. For example, a particular route segment may have relatively low ridership as of the time that segment is recommended to be built; but may experience a significant increase in ridership once that route segment becomes incorporated into the County-wide RTV system (e.g., Norbeck Road between Veirs Mill Road and ICC). In this instance, that route segment may be constructed to start out as merely enhanced bus service on a dedicated lane, but without all of the “gold standard” designs and attributes that would be the trademark of the County-wide RTV system. But the expectation would be that ultimately ridership would grow --- perhaps rapidly and exponentially, as that route becomes integrated into a comprehensive RTV system that establishes a “critical mass” of ridership --- which, in turn, would justify making additional investments to elevate that route segment’s attributes from mere enhanced bus service to the “gold standard” RTV system. From a branding standpoint, it would be important in this case NOT to consider the route part of the County’s RTV system at its initial stage of mere enhanced bus service; but instead, as part of an inter-connected multi-modal system that is distinguishable from the fully graduated “gold standard” RTV system. Only when a route has all the signature designs and attributes of the “gold standard” RTV system would that route be considered as having “graduated” to the RTV system, so as not to dilute the value of our unique RTV brand.

## **RECOMMENDED RESOLUTIONS FOR THE TRANSIT TASK FORCE**

With these considerations and with these caveats, Work Group “D” recommends the Transit Task Force adopt the following resolutions:

**RESOLVED, that the Transit Task Force approves an amendment to its August 17, 2011 resolution to add the following additional route segments to the proposed County-wide rapid transit system:**

- (a) Old Georgetown Road from Tuckerman Lane north to Montrose Road/Randolph Road, which should be designed to be incorporated into the new road alignments proposed in the approved White Flint Master Plan; and**
- (b) Wisconsin Avenue from Bethesda Metro Station to Friendship Heights Metro Station.**

**FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Transit Task Force approves a further amendment to its August 17, 2011 resolution to allow for the following extensions of route segments to the County boundary lines, so that the County’s proposed RTV system could be coordinated and integrated with surrounding jurisdictions, as applicable:**

- (a) Route 29 from Burtonsville north to Howard County line;**

- (b) Cherry Hill Road from FDA Boulevard east to Prince George's County line;
- (c) Georgia Avenue from Silver Spring Transit Center south to District of Columbia line;
- (d) Wisconsin Avenue from Friendship Heights south to District of Columbia line;
- (e) Route 355 from Clarksburg/CCT north to Frederick County line; and
- (f) To I-495 and/or I-270, as necessary and appropriate.

**FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the Transit Task Force authorizes and approves transmitting these amendments to the County Executive, together with the Transit Task Force's recommendation that the County Executive recommend to the County Council and the Planning Board (as appropriate) including the additional route segments as described in these amendments into the County's Master Plan of Highways and Transitways, thereby providing necessary reservations of rights-of-way and plans for the Transit Task Force's proposed County-wide RTV system.

**FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the Transit Task Force approves and recommends to the County Executive the specific phasing and sequencing of route segments as more fully set forth in the appended pages and maps.

After analysis and discussion by the Transit Task Force at its meeting held on October 5, 2011, the Transit Task Force adopted the reasoning and intent of Work Group D's Preliminary Recommendations described above, and the Transit Task Force adopted the Resolutions set forth above by a vote of 14 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstaining (Casey Anderson).\*\*

The following Task Force Members were in attendance: Casey Anderson, Marilyn Balcombe, Nat Bottigheimer, Marc Elrich, Jonathan Genn, David Hauck, Art Holmes, David McDonough, Wayne Phyllaier, Rich Parsons, Craig Simoneau, Tina Slater, Francine Waters, Dan Wilhelm, Mark Winston, and Diane Ratcliff representing Darrell Mobley.

The following Task Force Members were absent: Roger Berliner, Francoise Carrier, Henry Montes, and Jonathan Sachs.

## PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDED ROUTE SEGMENT SEQUENCING

### PHASE ONE

(These routes are not listed in any presumed order of priority; but instead, listed simply according to length of segment. All routes identified for Phase One are presumed to be built out simultaneously to the maximum practical extent, factoring in: availability of alternative travel routes during construction phases, availability of transit alternatives during construction phases, possible disruption of traffic patterns during construction, the efficient deployment of construction crews and machinery, and other construction practicalities.)

<u>Route Segment</u>	<u>Estimated Length</u>
<b>ICC</b> (I-270 to 29/Colesville Road)**	22.9 miles**
<b>RANDOLPH ROAD</b> (355/Rockville Pike to FDA Boulevard)	12.5 miles
<b>355/ROCKVILLE PIKE</b> (Mont Village Ave to Bethesda Metro Station)	12.1 miles
<b>ROUTE 29/COLESVILLE ROAD</b> (Burtonsville/198 to Silver Spring Metro)	10.7 miles
<b>GEORGIA AVENUE (North)</b> (Olney to Veirs Mill Road)	9.8 miles
<b>VEIRS MILL ROAD</b> (Rockville/County Office Buildings/Metro to Wheaton Metro Station/Georgia Ave)	6.7 miles
<hr/>	
<b>TOTAL MILES IN PHASE ONE:</b>	<b>~74.7 miles<sup>1</sup></b> ( ~51.8 “new construction” miles in Phase One, if ICC = “RTV ready”)**

---

<sup>1</sup> This Phase One listing presumes the CCT is built as light rail and not as part of RTV system. If, however, the CCT were to be built as part of the RTV system, then the Transit Task Force recommends the CCT segment be built as part of this Phase One, which would add an additional ~15.0 miles to the Phase One system (making the total miles in Phase One ~89.7 miles).

## **PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDED ROUTE SEGMENT SEQUENCING**

### **PHASE TWO**

(These routes are not listed in any presumed order of priority; but instead, listed simply according to length of segment. All routes identified for Phase Two are presumed to be built out simultaneously to the maximum practical extent, factoring in: availability of alternative travel routes during construction phases, availability of transit alternatives during construction phases, possible disruption of traffic patterns during construction, the efficient deployment of construction crews and machinery, and other construction practicalities.)

<u>Route Segment</u>	<u>Estimated Length</u>
<b>NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE</b> (ICC to Fort Totten*)	10.1 miles
<b>CONNECTICUT AVENUE</b> (Georgia Avenue/Aspen Hill to Purple Line and spur on Jones Bridge Road to Rockville Pike/Medical Center)	7.6 miles
<b>UNIVERSITY BOULEVARD</b> (Georgia Ave to New Hampshire Ave/Purple Line)	6.4 miles
<b>OLD GEORGETOWN ROAD</b> (Montrose Parkway/Randolph Road to Bethesda Metro/Wisconsin Avenue)	5.8 miles
<b>ROUTE 28 TO ICC</b> (From Veirs Mill Road to ICC)	5.5 miles
<b>ROCKVILLE TOWN CENTER TO LSC</b> (Route 28/Monroe St/County Offices/Metro to Life Sciences Center/CCT connection)	5.3 miles
<b>NORTH BETHESDA TRANSITWAY/ DEMOCRACY BOULEVARD</b> (355/Rockville Pike to Tuckerman to Democracy Blvd/Montgomery Mall)	5.1 miles
<hr/>	
<b>TOTAL MILES IN PHASE TWO:</b>	<b>~45.8 miles</b>

\*Approximately 5.3 miles of this segment, south of Elton Road/Beltway, presumes coordination with Prince George's County and the District of Columbia.

## **PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDED ROUTE SEGMENT SEQUENCING**

### **PHASE THREE (All Remaining Segments After Phase Two)**

(These routes are not listed in any presumed order of priority; but instead, listed simply according to length of segment. All routes identified for Phase Three are presumed to be built out simultaneously to the maximum practical extent, factoring in: availability of alternative travel routes during construction phases, availability of transit alternatives during construction phases, possible disruption of traffic patterns during construction, the efficient deployment of construction crews and machinery, and other construction practicalities.)

<u>Route Segment</u>	<u>Estimated Length</u>
<b>355/ROCKVILLE PIKE</b> (Montgomery Village Avenue to Clarksburg/CCT, including the Spur at Middlebrook Road via Observation Drive and Montgomery College-Germantown)	14.9 miles
<b>MID COUNTY CONNECTOR</b> (Clarksburg/MD 27 to ICC)**	13.4 miles
<b>LAKEFOREST MALL/MUDDY BRANCH RD</b> (CCT to Gaithersburg)	7.2 miles
<b>GEORGIA AVENUE (South)</b> (Veirs Mill Road to Silver Spring Transit Center)	3.9 miles
<b>WISCONSIN AVENUE</b> (Bethesda Metro to Friendship Heights Metro)	1.6 miles
<b>NORTHWEST CONNECTOR</b> (Between CCT and 355 - TBD)	1.0 miles

---

<b>TOTAL MILES IN PHASE THREE:</b>	<b>~42.0 miles</b>
------------------------------------	--------------------

<b>TOTAL MILES OF ALL PHASES:</b>	<b>~162.5 miles</b>
-----------------------------------	---------------------

*(Total of ~139.6 "new construction" miles if ICC = "RTV Ready")\*\*  
(Total of ~177.5 miles if CCT were RTV)*